UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,530	02/26/2002	Paul M. Hendley	SMQ-085	9799

46141	7590	04/10/2006		EXAMINER

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
28 STATE STREET
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER
JEAN GILLES, JUDE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/085,530	HENDLEY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jude J. Jean-Gilles	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 December 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-7 and 9-24</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-7 and 9-24</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>26 February 2002</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Action is in regards to the Reply received on 12/22/2005.

Response to Amendment

1.   This action is responsive to the application filed on 12/22/2005. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6,

7, 9, 10, 13, and 22 were amended. Claim 8 is cancelled. There are no newly added

claims. Claims 1-7, and 9-24 are pending. Claims 1-7, and 9-24 represent a method

and apparatus for "Command Line Interface session tool."

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 6, 10, 18, 21, 22, 23, and 24 have

been carefully considered, but are not deemed fully persuasive. Applicant's arguments

are deemed moot in view of the existing ground of rejection as explained here below.

The dependent claims stand rejected as articulated in the First Office Action and

all objections not addressed in Applicant's response are herein reiterated.

In response to Applicant's arguments, 37 CFR § 1.11(c) requires applicant to

"clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in

view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He

or she must show the amendments avoid such references or objections."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 6, 10-12, 14-17 and 23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bach et al (Bach), Patent No. 6,141,660, in view of Carino Jr.

(Carino), U.S. Patent No. 5,754,841.

Regarding **claim 6**, Batch discloses in an electronic device in communication

with a network, a method for interacting with a server, comprising the steps of:

storing a file; parsing the file to decipher information pertaining to CLI commands

(*column 17, lines 3-67*).

Sending an update file containing at least one user-defined CLI command to the

server *(see Bach, column 10, lines 47-67)*.

However, Batch is not specific on receiving a file containing CLI registration

information from the server.

In the same field of endeavor, Carino discloses a client where the user places

general call .....and receive results set elements and stages them for display ...or

further processing by the client's application [see Carino, column 4, lines 16-27].

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Carino's

teachings to use a client received data in a file, with the teachings of Bach, for

the purpose of "*minimizing effort in developing new applications ...*" as stated by

Bach in lines 30-35 of column 4 and to "*promote used of improved techniques for*

accessing hierarchical data through a client CLI to minimize the effort involved in

developing new application programs"..." in lines 31-35 of column 4. By this

rationale **claim 6** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 10**, the combination Batch-Carino discloses in an electronic

server device in communication with a network, a method for interacting with a

database (*see Batch, fig. 1, items 102, and 110-112*), comprising the steps of:

receiving a request from a command line interface client (*see Batch, column 5,*

lines 35-67; column 6, lines 1-41; fig. 4, items 100, and 403);

mapping the request to an instance of an object class (see Carino, column 4,

lines 16-59);

the object class instance querying the database to respond to the request (*see*

Batch, column 10, lines 28-58);

the object class instance instructing the construction of an outgoing user

interface (*see Batch, column 16, lines 63-67; column 17, lines 1-67*); and

constructing the outgoing user interface and sending a response to the request of

the command line interface client (*see Batch, column 16, lines 63-67; column 17, lines*

1-67).

Regarding **claim 11**, the combination Batch-Carino discloses the method of claim

10, wherein the step of receiving a request comprises receiving an interface command

from the command line interface client, the interface command being one of a

predetermined set of interface commands (*see Batch, column 16, lines 63-67; column 17, lines 1-67*).

Regarding **claim 12**, the combination Batch-Carino discloses the method of claim 10, wherein the step of receiving a request comprises receiving an interface command from the command line interface client, the interface command being an interface command provided by the command line interface client (*see Batch, column 5, lines 35-67; column 6, lines 1-41; fig. 4, items 100, and 403*). .

Regarding **claim 14**, the combination Batch-Carino discloses the method of claim 10, wherein the step of the object class instance querying the registration service comprises the object class instance pushing results of the request into a context accessible by a server page for constructing the user interface (*see Batch, column 5, lines 35-67; column 6, lines 1-41; fig. 4, items 100, and 403*).

Regarding **claim 15**, the combination Batch-Carino discloses the method of claim 10, wherein the step of instruction the construction of an outgoing user interface comprises a selection of a server page corresponding to the language of the command line interface client request (*see Batch, column 15, lines 1-28*).

Regarding **claim 16**, the combination Batch-Carino discloses the method of claim 10, wherein the request relates to a list of registered applications (*see Batch, column 5, lines 34-67*).

Regarding **claim 17**, the combination Batch-Carino discloses the method of claim 10, wherein the database comprises a registration service (*see Batch, column 7, lines 53-67*).

Regarding **claim 23**, the combination Batch-Carino discloses a computer

readable medium containing a software tool for executing a method in an electronic

server device in communication with a network for interacting with a database (*see*

Batch, fig. 1, items 102, and 110-112), the method comprising the steps of:

receiving a request from a command line interface client (*see Batch, column 5,*

lines 35-67; column 6, lines 1-41; fig. 4, items 100, and 403);

mapping the request to an instance of an object class (*see Batch, column 9, lines*

37-67; column 10, lines 1-25);

the object class instance querying the database to respond to the request (see

Carino, column4, lines 16-59);

the object class instance instructing the construction of an outgoing user

interface (*see Batch, column 16, lines 63-67; column 17, lines 1-67*); and

constructing the outgoing user interface and sending a response to the request to

the command line interface client (*see Batch, column 16, lines 63-67; column 17, lines*

1-67).

5. **Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 18-22, and 24-** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bach, and Chen et al (Chen), U.S. Patent No. 6,625,590 B1 in

further view of Carino.

Regarding **claim 1**, Bach discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Bach

teaches in an electronic server device in communication with a network, a method for

interacting with a client, comprising the steps of:

downloading a file containing CLI registration information to the client (*column 10, lines 27-58; column 17, lines 1-12*); and

receiving at least one update from the client (column 11, lines 9-21). However, Bach does not specifically teach an update containing at least one user-defined CLI command.

In the same field of endeavor, Chen discloses "*a client command line Interface to create new Unified Command Interface suitable for other accessing other objects ...*" [*see Chen, column 7, lines 25-42; column 9, lines 2-27*]. Note that in the same field of endeavor, Carino also discloses a client where the user places general call .....and receive results set elements and stages them for display ...or further processing by the client's application [see Carino, column 4, lines 16-59].

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Chen's teachings to use a client originating CLI command, with the teachings of Bach, for the purpose of "*providing integration of features such as automation, bundling of commands, script processing, and cut-and-paste editing operation in a command prompt user interface...*" as stated by Chen in lines 40-42 of column 1. Bach also provides motivation to combine by promoting used of improved techniques for accessing hierarchical data through a client CLI to minimize the effort involved in developing new application programs..." in lines 31-35 of column 4. By this rationale **claim 1** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 2**, the combination Batch-Carino -Chen discloses the method of

claim 1, further comprising storing the at least one user-defined CLI command [*see*

Bach, column 11, lines 9-21]. The same motivation used for **claim 1** is also valid for

claim 2 [see Chen, column 1, lines 40-42; see Bach, column 4, lines 31-35]. By this

rationale **claim 2** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 3**, the combination Batch-Carino -Chen discloses the method of

claim 1, wherein the update comprises at least one update file [*see Chen, column 7,*

lines 25-42]. The same motivation used for **claim 1** is also valid for **claim 3** [see Chen,

column 1, lines 40-42; see Bach, column 4, lines 31-35]. By this rationale **claim 3** is

rejected.

Regarding **claim 4**, the combination Batch-Carino -Chen discloses the method of

claim 3, further comprising downloading the at least one update file containing at least

one user-defined CLI command to a second client [*see Chen, fig. 2, item 62; see Bach,*

fig. 1, 104]. The same motivation used for **claim 1** is also valid for **claim 4** [see Chen,

column 1, lines 40-42; see Bach, column 4, lines 31-35]. By this rationale **claim 4** is

rejected.

Regarding **claim 5**, the combination the combination Batch-Carino -Chen

discloses the method of claim 3, wherein the file and the at least one update file are

XML files [*see Bach, column 5, lines 35-45; column 11, lines 9-21*]. The same

motivation used for **claim 1** is also valid for **claim 5** [see Chen, column 1, lines 40-42;

see Bach, column 4, lines 31-35]. By this rationale **claim 5** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 7**, the combination Batch-Carino -Chen discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising establishing an update file-containing at least one client originating command [*see Bach, column 17, lines 3-67*]. The same motivation used for **claim 1** is also valid for **claim 7**[see Chen, column 1, lines 40-42; see Bach, column 4, lines 31-35]. By this rationale **claim 7** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 9**, the combination Batch-Carino -Chen discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising receiving an additional filed containing CLI registration information comprising a new CLI command from a distinct client [*see Bach, fig. 1, items 102, 110-112*]. The same motivation used for **claim 1** is also valid for **claim 9** [see Chen, column 1, lines 40-42; see Bach, column 4, lines 31-35]. By this rationale **claim 9** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 13**, the combination Batch-Carino -Chen discloses the method of claim 10, wherein the step of mapping comprises the controller servlet mapping the request to the object class instance. Examiner takes notice that an the use of a controller servlet for mapping a request to a object class instance is well-known in the art and that it would have been obvious for an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to integrate this mapping techniques into the invention of Bach to obtain the current invention. By this rationale **claim 13** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 18**, the combination Batch-Carino -Chen discloses in an electronic client device, a method for interacting with a server, comprising the steps of:

sending a request from a command line interface of a command line interface

client to a server[*fig. 4, item 100, 403; column 5, lines 35-67; column 6, lines 1-41*]; and

receiving a response to the request at the command line interface client, such

that the command line interface client can present a user with the response [*fig. 4, item

100, 403; column 5, lines 35-67; column 6, lines 1-41*];

wherein the command line interface client utilizes at least one of commands

originating at the client [*see Chen, column 7, lines 25-42; column 9, lines 2-27*] and

commands originating at the server [*see Bach, column 11, lines 9-21*]. The same

motivation used for **claim 1** is also valid for **claim 18** [see Chen, column 1, lines 40-42;

see Bach, column 4, lines 31-35]. By this rationale **claim 18** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 19**, the combination Batch-Carino -Chen discloses the method

of claim 18, further comprising the step of automatically downloading commands from

the server upon connection with the server [*see Bach, column 12, lines 50-64*]. The

same motivation used for **claim 1** is also valid for **claim 19** [see Chen, column 1, lines

40-42; see Bach, column 4, lines 31-35]. By this rationale **claim 19** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 20**, the combination Batch-Carino -Chen discloses the method

of claim 18, wherein the server includes an application registration service [*see Bach,

column 5, lines 34-64; column 10, lines 47-67*]. The same motivation used for **claim 1**

is also valid for **claim 20** [see Chen, column 1, lines 40-42; see Bach, column 4, lines

31-35]. By this rationale **claim 20** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 21**, the combination Batch-Carino -Chen discloses a computer

readable medium containing an HTTP based software command line interface tool,

comprising:

a predetermined set of commands for executing tasks [*see Bach, column 17,*

lines 3-67]; and

a protocol for automatic connection with a remote session and management of

such connection, including downloading of commands from a server of the remote

session [*see Chen, column 8, lines 5-61*];

wherein the interface tool enables a client to add new interface commands to the

interface tool and remotely execute the new interface commands [*see Chen, column 8,*

lines 5-61]. The same motivation used for **claim 1** is also valid for **claim 21** [see Chen,

column 1, lines 40-42; see Bach, column 4, lines 31-35]. By this rationale **claim 21** is

rejected.

Regarding **claim 22**, the combination Batch-Carino -Chen discloses a computer

readable medium containing a software tool for executing a method in an electronic

server device in communication with a network for interacting with a client, the method

comprising the steps of:

downloading a file containing CLI registration information to the client [*see Bach,*

column 10, lines 27-58; column 17, lines 1-12]; and

receiving at least one update from the client [*see Bach, column 11, lines 9-21*].

containing at least one user-defined CLI command [*see Chen, column 7, lines 25-42;*

column 9, lines 2-27]. The same motivation used for **claim 1** is also valid for **claim 22**

[see Chen, column 1, lines 40-42; see Bach, column 4, lines 31-35]. By this rationale **claim 22** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 24**, the combination Batch-Carino -Chen discloses a computer readable medium containing a software tool for executing a method in an electronic client device for interacting with a server, the method comprising the steps of:

sending a request from a command line interface of a command line interface client to a server[*fig. 4, item 100, 403; column 5, lines 35-67; column 6, lines 1-41*]; and

receiving a response to the request at the command line interface client, such that the command line interface client can present a user with the response[*fig. 4, item 100, 403; column 5, lines 35-67; column 6, lines 1-41*];

wherein the command line interface client utilizes at least one of commands originating at the client [*see Chen, column 7, lines 25-42; column 9, lines 2-27*] and commands originating at the server [*see Bach, column 11, lines 9-21*]. The same motivation used for **claim 1** is also valid for **claim 24** [see Chen, column 1, lines 40-42; see Bach, column 4, lines 31-35]. By this rationale **claim 24** is rejected.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's Request for Reconsideration filed on 12/22/2005 has been carefully

considered but is not deemed fully persuasive. However, because there exists the

likelihood of future presentation of this argument, the Examiner thinks that it is prudent

to address Applicants' main points of contention.

      A. Applicants submit that the combination of Bach and Carino does not teach or

suggest the limitation of "sending an update file containing at least one user-

defined CLI command to the server" with respect to claim 6.

      B. The prior art of record does not teach or suggest mapping a request to an

instance of an object class, as required by claims 10, and 23 .

      C. Applicant contends that Batch, Carino, and Chen do not disclose that one

client sending a server an update file and another client downloading the same

update file.

7.   As to "Point A" it is the position of the Examiner that the combination of Batch

and Carino in detail teaches the limitations of "sending an update file containing at least

one user-defined CLI command to the4 server". However, in view of Applicant's

remarks, stating that both Batch and Carino do not teaches this limitation of the claim

the Examiner has made and effort to point out the sections of the prior art that disclose

this limitation [see Batch, column 14, lines 45-67; column 15, lines 1-26,].

      As to "Point B", it is the position of the Examiner that the combination of Batch

and Carino in detail teaches the limitations of "mapping a request to an instance of clas

object" (see Batch; column 6, lines 30-61).

As to pint C, see point A above.

Examiner notes with delight that no new matter has been added and that the new claims are supported by the application as filed. However, applicant has failed in presenting claims and drawings that delineate the contours of this invention as compared to the cited prior art. Applicant has failed to clearly point out patentable novelty in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited that would overcome the 102(e) anticipation and the 103(a) rejections applied against the claims, the rejection is therefore sustained.

Conclusion

8.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

examiner should be directed to Jude Jean-Gilles whose telephone number is (571) 272-

3914. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other

Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David Wiley, can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-

9000.

Jude Jean-Gilles

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2143

JJG

        March 31, 2006

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100